

can operate under a single control signal, while conventional SPDT devices need two control signals for their operation. See, for example, page 6, lines 17-20, of the specification.

The Examiner contends that MESFETs Q1, Q2 of Noguchi correspond to the claimed direct current isolation element. Applicants respectfully disagree. Noguchi's MESFETs Q1, Q2 are the switching elements themselves, not the claimed direct current isolation element.

Although a MESFET does have a high electric resistance between the source and the drain when it is switched off, persons of ordinary skill in the art understand that there is always a leakage current between the source and drain of a MESFET even when it is switched off. This is why Noguchi's device requires so called shunt FETs, i.e., Q3, Q4, to lead leakage currents to the ground. Noguchi itself confirms the existence of these leakage currents 28 between the source and drain in column 3, lines 10-15. Thus, Noguchi's MESFET Q1 cannot interrupt direct current between MESFET Q5, which the Examiner cites as corresponding to the claimed first switching element, and the common input terminal 11. Or, Noguchi's MESFET Q2 cannot interrupt direct current between MESFET Q6, which the Examiner cites as corresponding to the claimed second switching element, and the common input terminal 11. Accordingly, Noguchi does not teach or suggest the direct current isolation element of claim 1.

In addition, applicants point out to the Examiner that Noguchi does not disclose the claimed first connection that connects the control terminal to the second switching element. Although the Examiner contends that Fig. 5 of Noguchi shows a wire connecting the control terminal V_{G1} to the second switching element Q6 without citing any specific portion of this drawing, Fig. 5 does not include such a wire. In fact, Noguchi does not teach or suggest the claimed first connection at all because Noguchi's device operates on two control signals V_{G1} ,

V_{G2} and does not need the claimed connection that supplies to the second switching element the same control signal supplied to the first switching element.

The switching device of claim 7 also includes the same direct current isolation element and first connection as the device of claim 1. In addition, applicants point out that the claimed second connection connects the gate electrode of the second transistor to the ground. The resistors R3, R5, which the Examiner cites as corresponding to the claimed second connection, connect the source and drain of MESFET Q6, respectively, to the ground. However, the gate electrode of MESFET Q6 is connected to the control signal V_{G2}, but not to the ground.

Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 12 and 13 should be withdrawn.

In light of the above, a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952**, referencing Docket No. **492322002800**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 20, 2003

By: 

Barry E. Bretschneider
Registration No. 28,055

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 300
McLean, VA 22102-3915
Telephone: (703) 760-7743
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777